

## COMMENT FORM

Public Scoping Meetings

We need your input. Please take a few minutes to provide your comments or questions for the USDA RUS Federal Environmental Impact Statement process and return your completed form today or mail by June 29, 2009. Your comments help in the planning and implementation of the project. **Thank you.**

Completing this form will automatically add you to our mailing list. If you prefer to not be on the mailing list, please check the box below.

☐ I do not wish to be on the project mailing list

Which meeting did you attend? C.F.E. Meeting.

Please check the following issues that are important to you for transmission line siting.

- ☒ Project Purpose and Need
- ☐ Visual / Aesthetic resources
- ☐ Proximity to residences
- ☒ Land use (agriculture, residential, recreation)
- ☐ Water resources (floodplains, river crossings)
- ☐ Biological resources (wildlife habitat, raptors)
- ☐ Historic and cultural sites
- ☒ Radio or television interference
- ☒ Noise
- ☐ Health and safety
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

What additional key issues should be addressed when assessing the potential impacts of this project?

We would like it set up to put up  
wind towers. We really would like to  
see some go up. We have a wind between  
class 3 & 4. I live 3 miles from the  
coal power plant. I live on a bluff.

Hampton • Rochester • La Crosse 345 kV Transmission Project

**I-190-001**

Your comment has been noted. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

If you own property in one of the proposed corridors, please indicate all the existing uses of your property below:

- ☒ Agriculture      ☐ Residential      ☐ Conservation Easement  
☐ Commercial      ☐ Industrial      ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe any special uses or circumstances on your property that should be considered when assessing the Project. Please indicate the location of your property.

I-190-001

The poles ARE ON EACH side of my field.  
I do NOT WANT ANY SET in the field.  
IF THEY PUT the new pole where the old  
ones ARE, there is NO ~~problem~~ trouble.

In your opinion, what are the most sensitive resources (biological, cultural, recreational, ect.) in the Project area and why?

None.

In your opinion, was the project description, purpose, and need for the project adequately explained? If not, what additional information is needed?

yes it was.

Please tell us how to reach you.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Name: Wesley WALD

Representing (Optional):

Mailing Address: W1712 Cty Rd .E.

City: ALMA State: WI Zip Code: 54610

Daytime Phone (Optional): 608 685 3588

Public participation for the Federal, Minnesota, and Wisconsin permitting processes will be ongoing for the Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345 kV Transmission Project. If you sign up for the mailing list, you will be notified when opportunities to participate are being planned.

Please plan to continue your involvement in the process and provide your comments. We appreciate your input.

## COMMENT FORM

Public Scoping Meetings

We need your input. Please take a few minutes to provide your comments or questions for the USDA RUS Federal Environmental Impact Statement process and return your completed form today or mail by June 29, 2009. Your comments help in the planning and implementation of the project. **Thank you.**

Completing this form will automatically add you to our mailing list. If you prefer to not be on the mailing list, please check the box below.

☐ I do not wish to be on the project mailing list

Which meeting did you attend? Wanamingo (attended by family member)

Please check the following issues that are important to you for transmission line siting.

- ☐ Project Purpose and Need
- ☒ Visual / Aesthetic resources
- ☒ Proximity to residences
- ☒ Land use (agriculture, residential, recreation)
- ☐ Water resources (floodplains, river crossings)
- ☐ Biological resources (wildlife habitat, raptors)
- ☐ Historic and cultural sites
- ☒ Radio or television interference
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Health and safety
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

What additional key issues should be addressed when assessing the potential impacts of this project?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Hampton - Rochester - La Crosse 345 kV



If you own property in one of the proposed corridors, please indicate all the existing uses of your property below:

☒ Agriculture ☐ Residential ☐ Conservation Easement  
☐ Commercial ☐ Industrial ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe any special uses or circumstances on your property that should be considered when assessing the Project. Please indicate the location of your property.

I-191-001 | I operate a dairy farm less than a half mile  
south of the proposed route in Section 27 of Holden  
township. I have concerns over stray voltage from the  
I-191-003 | line and concerned about the route cutting through  
prime agricultural land. I feel our farm land should  
I-191-002 | be protected. The route should follow existing roads.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

In your opinion, what are the most sensitive resources (biological, cultural, recreational, ect.) in the Project area and why?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

#### I-191-001

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to human and livestock health and safety with regard to stray voltage will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

#### I-191-002

Your comment has been noted. The criteria used to route the transmission line is described in the Macro Corridor Study which is available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. These criteria and routing process will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The project is still in the development and planning stages and the utilities have not yet permitted a route for the transmission line.

#### I-191-003

Your comment has been noted. The criteria used to route the transmission line is described in the Macro Corridor Study which is available at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. These criteria and routing process will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The project is still in the development and planning stages and the utilities have not yet permitted a route for the transmission line. Potential impacts to agricultural resources will also be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

In your opinion, was the project description, purpose, and need for the project adequately explained? If not, what additional information is needed?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Please tell us how to reach you.

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

Name: Jim Way

Representing (Optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: 3357 450<sup>th</sup> St.

City: Kenyon State: MN Zip Code: 55946

Daytime Phone (Optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Public participation for the Federal, Minnesota, and Wisconsin permitting processes will be ongoing for the Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345 kV Transmission Project. If you sign up for the mailing list, you will be notified when opportunities to participate are being planned.

Please plan to continue your involvement in the process and provide your comments. We appreciate your input.

## COMMENT FORM

Public Scoping Meetings

We need your input. Please take a few minutes to provide your comments or questions for the USDA RUS Federal Environmental Impact Statement process and return your completed form today or mail by June 29, 2009. Your comments help in the planning and implementation of the project. **Thank you.**

Completing this form will automatically add you to our mailing list. If you prefer to not be on the mailing list, please check the box below.

☐ I do not wish to be on the project mailing list

Which meeting did you attend? Plainview, MN

Please check the following issues that are important to you for transmission line siting.

- ☐ Project Purpose and Need
- ☐ Visual / Aesthetic resources
- ☒ Proximity to residences
- ☒ Land use (agriculture, residential, recreation)
- ☐ Water resources (floodplains, river crossings)
- ☐ Biological resources (wildlife habitat, raptors)
- ☐ Historic and cultural sites
- ☒ Radio or television interference
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Health and safety
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

What additional key issues should be addressed when assessing the potential impacts of this project?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Hampton • Rochester • La Crosse 345 kV Transmission Project

If you own property in one of the proposed corridors, please indicate all the existing uses of your property below:

☒ Agriculture ☒ Residential ☐ Conservation Easement  
☐ Commercial ☐ Industrial ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe any special uses or circumstances on your property that should be considered when assessing the Project. Please indicate the location of your property.

Farmington Township Section 7, Olmsted County MN  
Actual line appears to come within  
120 feet of residence. At 77 years of age  
it is time to sell Property and move to  
a home that is handicap accessible.  
The value of this property is already  
affected because of this potential route.

In your opinion, what are the most sensitive resources (biological, cultural, recreational, ect.) in the Project area and why?

#### I-192-001

Your comment has been noted. Socioeconomic impacts to property values affected by the transmission line will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

I-192-001

In your opinion, was the project description, purpose, and need for the project adequately explained? If not, what additional information is needed?

In my opinion this project is  
not needed.

Please tell us how to reach you.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Name: Allen Whipple

Representing (Optional):

Mailing Address: 12005 Highway 63 North

City: Rochester

State: MN

Zip Code: 55906

Daytime Phone (Optional):

Public participation for the Federal, Minnesota, and Wisconsin permitting processes will be ongoing for the Hampton- Rochester- La Crosse 345 kV Transmission Project. If you sign up for the mailing list, you will be notified when opportunities to participate are being planned.

Please plan to continue your involvement in the process and provide your comments. We appreciate your input.

## COMMENT FORM

Public Scoping Meetings

We need your input. Please take a few minutes to provide your comments or questions for the USDA RUS Federal Environmental Impact Statement process and return your completed form today or mail by June 29, 2009. Your comments help in the planning and implementation of the project. **Thank you.**

Completing this form will automatically add you to our mailing list. If you prefer to not be on the mailing list, please check the box below.

☐ I do not wish to be on the project mailing list

Which meeting did you attend? \_\_\_\_\_

Please check the following issues that are important to you for transmission line siting.

- ☐ Project Purpose and Need
- ☐ Visual / Aesthetic resources
- ☒ Proximity to residences
- ☒ Land use (agriculture, residential, recreation)
- ☐ Water resources (floodplains, river crossings)
- ☐ Biological resources (wildlife habitat, raptors)
- ☐ Historic and cultural sites
- ☐ Radio or television interference
- ☒ Noise
- ☒ Health and safety
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

What additional key issues should be addressed when assessing the potential impacts of this project?

I-193-002 | Our recommendation would be to build  
the transmission lines along existing  
interstate highways where easements are  
obtained. Additional agricultural land  
purchased would be minimal.

Hampton • Rochester • La Crosse 345 kV Transmission Project

If you own property in one of the proposed corridors, please indicate all the existing uses of your property below:

☒ Agriculture

☐ Residential

☐ Conservation Easement

☐ Commercial

☐ Industrial

☒ Other: Milking Herd

Please describe any special uses or circumstances on your property that should be considered when assessing the Project. Please indicate the location of your property.

We own and operate a 400 cow milking herd and are concerned with the closeness in proximity of a proposed transmission line. Our concern is the energy field surrounding the lines and health affects. ~~Milk~~ Production of milk loss to our herd from cattle ~~not~~ being in close proximity to the energy field.

In your opinion, what are the most sensitive resources (biological, cultural, recreational, ect.) in the Project area and why?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

#### I-193-001

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to human and livestock health and safety with regard to EMF will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

#### I-193-002

Your comment has been noted. The criteria used to route the transmission line is described in the Macro Corridor Study which is available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. These criteria and routing process will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The project is still in the development and planning stages and the utilities have not yet permitted a route for the transmission line.

1.  $\frac{1}{2}$  2.  $\frac{1}{3}$  3.  $\frac{1}{4}$  4.  $\frac{1}{5}$  5.  $\frac{1}{6}$  6.  $\frac{1}{7}$  7.  $\frac{1}{8}$  8.  $\frac{1}{9}$  9.  $\frac{1}{10}$  10.  $\frac{1}{11}$  11.  $\frac{1}{12}$  12.  $\frac{1}{13}$  13.  $\frac{1}{14}$  14.  $\frac{1}{15}$  15.  $\frac{1}{16}$  16.  $\frac{1}{17}$  17.  $\frac{1}{18}$  18.  $\frac{1}{19}$  19.  $\frac{1}{20}$  20.  $\frac{1}{21}$  21.  $\frac{1}{22}$  22.  $\frac{1}{23}$  23.  $\frac{1}{24}$  24.  $\frac{1}{25}$  25.  $\frac{1}{26}$  26.  $\frac{1}{27}$  27.  $\frac{1}{28}$  28.  $\frac{1}{29}$  29.  $\frac{1}{30}$  30.  $\frac{1}{31}$  31.  $\frac{1}{32}$  32.  $\frac{1}{33}$  33.  $\frac{1}{34}$  34.  $\frac{1}{35}$  35.  $\frac{1}{36}$  36.  $\frac{1}{37}$  37.  $\frac{1}{38}$  38.  $\frac{1}{39}$  39.  $\frac{1}{40}$  40.  $\frac{1}{41}$  41.  $\frac{1}{42}$  42.  $\frac{1}{43}$  43.  $\frac{1}{44}$  44.  $\frac{1}{45}$  45.  $\frac{1}{46}$  46.  $\frac{1}{47}$  47.  $\frac{1}{48}$  48.  $\frac{1}{49}$  49.  $\frac{1}{50}$  50.  $\frac{1}{51}$  51.  $\frac{1}{52}$  52.  $\frac{1}{53}$  53.  $\frac{1}{54}$  54.  $\frac{1}{55}$  55.  $\frac{1}{56}$  56.  $\frac{1}{57}$  57.  $\frac{1}{58}$  58.  $\frac{1}{59}$  59.  $\frac{1}{60}$  60.  $\frac{1}{61}$  61.  $\frac{1}{62}$  62.  $\frac{1}{63}$  63.  $\frac{1}{64}$  64.  $\frac{1}{65}$  65.  $\frac{1}{66}$  66.  $\frac{1}{67}$  67.  $\frac{1}{68}$  68.  $\frac{1}{69}$  69.  $\frac{1}{70}$  70.  $\frac{1}{71}$  71.  $\frac{1}{72}$  72.  $\frac{1}{73}$  73.  $\frac{1}{74}$  74.  $\frac{1}{75}$  75.  $\frac{1}{76}$  76.  $\frac{1}{77}$  77.  $\frac{1}{78}$  78.  $\frac{1}{79}$  79.  $\frac{1}{80}$  80.  $\frac{1}{81}$  81.  $\frac{1}{82}$  82.  $\frac{1}{83}$  83.  $\frac{1}{84}$  84.  $\frac{1}{85}$  85.  $\frac{1}{86}$  86.  $\frac{1}{87}$  87.  $\frac{1}{88}$  88.  $\frac{1}{89}$  89.  $\frac{1}{90}$  90.  $\frac{1}{91}$  91.  $\frac{1}{92}$  92.  $\frac{1}{93}$  93.  $\frac{1}{94}$  94.  $\frac{1}{95}$  95.  $\frac{1}{96}$  96.  $\frac{1}{97}$  97.  $\frac{1}{98}$  98.  $\frac{1}{99}$  99.  $\frac{1}{100}$  100.  $\frac{1}{101}$  101.  $\frac{1}{102}$  102.  $\frac{1}{103}$  103.  $\frac{1}{104}$  104.  $\frac{1}{105}$  105.  $\frac{1}{106}$  106.  $\frac{1}{107}$  107.  $\frac{1}{108}$  108.  $\frac{1}{109}$  109.  $\frac{1}{110}$  110.  $\frac{1}{111}$  111.  $\frac{1}{112}$  112.  $\frac{1}{113}$  113.  $\frac{1}{114}$  114.  $\frac{1}{115}$  115.  $\frac{1}{116}$  116.  $\frac{1}{117}$  117.  $\frac{1}{118}$  118.  $\frac{1}{119}$  119.  $\frac{1}{120}$  120.  $\frac{1}{121}$  121.  $\frac{1}{122}$  122.  $\frac{1}{123}$  123.  $\frac{1}{124}$  124.  $\frac{1}{125}$  125.  $\frac{1}{126}$  126.  $\frac{1}{127}$  127.  $\frac{1}{128}$  128.  $\frac{1}{129}$  129.  $\frac{1}{130}$  130.  $\frac{1}{131}$  131.  $\frac{1}{132}$  132.  $\frac{1}{133}$  133.  $\frac{1}{134}$  134.  $\frac{1}{135}$  135.  $\frac{1}{136}$  136.  $\frac{1}{137}$  137.  $\frac{1}{138}$  138.  $\frac{1}{139}$  139.  $\frac{1}{140}$  140.  $\frac{1}{141}$  141.  $\frac{1}{142}$  142.  $\frac{1}{143}$  143.  $\frac{1}{144}$  144.  $\frac{1}{145}$  145.  $\frac{1}{146}$  146.  $\frac{1}{147}$  147.  $\frac{1}{148}$  148.  $\frac{1}{149}$  149.  $\frac{1}{150}$  150.  $\frac{1}{151}$  151.  $\frac{1}{152}$  152.  $\frac{1}{153}$  153.  $\frac{1}{154}$  154.  $\frac{1}{155}$  155.  $\frac{1}{156}$  156.  $\frac{1}{157}$  157.  $\frac{1}{158}$  158.  $\frac{1}{159}$  159.  $\frac{1}{160}$  160.  $\frac{1}{161}$  161.  $\frac{1}{162}$  162.  $\frac{1}{163}$  163.  $\frac{1}{164}$  164.  $\frac{1}{165}$  165.  $\frac{1}{166}$  166.  $\frac{1}{167}$  167.  $\frac{1}{168}$  168.  $\frac{1}{169}$  169.  $\frac{1}{170}$  170.  $\frac{1}{171}$  171.  $\frac{1}{172}$  172.  $\frac{1}{173}$  173.  $\frac{1}{174}$  174.  $\frac{1}{175}$  175.  $\frac{1}{176}$  176.  $\frac{1}{177}$  177.  $\frac{1}{178}$  178.  $\frac{1}{179}$  179.  $\frac{1}{180}$  180.  $\frac{1}{181}$  181.  $\frac{1}{182}$  182.  $\frac{1}{183}$  183.  $\frac{1}{184}$  184.  $\frac{1}{185}$  185.  $\frac{1}{186}$  186.  $\frac{1}{187}$  187.  $\frac{1}{188}$  188.  $\frac{1}{189}$  189.  $\frac{1}{190}$  190.  $\frac{1}{191}$  191.  $\frac{1}{192}$  192.  $\frac{1}{193}$  193.  $\frac{1}{194}$  194.  $\frac{1}{195}$  195.  $\frac{1}{196}$  196.  $\frac{1}{197}$  197.  $\frac{1}{198}$  198.  $\frac{1}{199}$  199.  $\frac{1}{200}$  200.  $\frac{1}{201}$  201.  $\frac{1}{202}$  202.  $\frac{1}{203}$  203.  $\frac{1}{204}$  204.  $\frac{1}{205}$  205.  $\frac{1}{206}$  206.  $\frac{1}{207}$  207.  $\frac{1}{208}$  208.  $\frac{1}{209}$  209.  $\frac{1}{210}$  210.  $\frac{1}{211}$  211.  $\frac{1}{212}$  212.  $\frac{1}{213}$  213.  $\frac{1}{214}$  214.  $\frac{1}{215}$  215.  $\frac{1}{216}$  216.  $\frac{1}{217}$  217.  $\frac{1}{218}$  218.  $\frac{1}{219}$  219.  $\frac{1}{220}$  220.  $\frac{1}{221}$  221.  $\frac{1}{222}$  222.  $\frac{1}{223}$  223.  $\frac{1}{224}$  224.  $\frac{1}{225}$  225.  $\frac{1}{226}$  226.  $\frac{1}{227}$  227.  $\frac{1}{228}$  228.  $\frac{1}{229}$  229.  $\frac{1}{230}$  230.  $\frac{1}{231}$  231.  $\frac{1}{232}$  232.  $\frac{1}{233}$  233.  $\frac{1}{234}$  234.  $\frac{1}{235}$  235.  $\frac{1}{236}$  236.  $\frac{1}{237}$  237.  $\frac{1}{238}$  238.  $\frac{1}{239}$  239.  $\frac{1}{240}$  240

## CONTACT INFORMATION

*Please plan to continue your involvement in the process and provide your comments. We appreciate your input.*



---

**Collins, Carly**

---

**From:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC [Stephanie.Strength@wdc.usda.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2009 8:21 AM  
**To:** Lilley, Bliss  
**Cc:** Collins, Carly  
**Subject:** FW:  
**Attachments:** EIS letter to USDA 6-19-09.docx  
**Categories:** pulled

---

**From:** bwood@sspps.org [mailto:bwood@sspps.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 19, 2009 2:42 PM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Cc:** docbernwood@aol.com  
**Subject:**

Stephanie,  
I would like to submit this letter as part of the public comments for the scoping hearing.  
Thank you.  
Bernadette

Dr. Bernadette E. Wood  
23775 Essex Avenue  
Farmington Min 55024  
651-460-2347  
[docbernwood@aol.com](mailto:docbernwood@aol.com)

June 19, 2009

Stephanie Strong

USDA

As a 12 year resident of Eureka Township in Dakota County, I live within ½ mile of the proposed Hampton to LaCrosse section of the CAPX 2020 power line.

**I-194-001**

I believe that the Environmental Impact Statement being conducted by the USDA should recommend a no-build alternative, which relies on conservation, local generation and local transmission to provide for our future energy needs. This alternative would protect the Mississippi Flyway, the Wildlife Refuge, or any of the other protected natural areas from the harmful affects of the power line.

**I-194-003**

**I-194-004**

At this stage, a no build alternative is a viable option due to the fact that demand is dropping and the La Crosse line is not needed. The EIS should use Xcel Energy's and Dairyland Power's most current forecasts, not old out-of-date information;

**I-194-005**

Conservation, local generation and local transmission can solve any local reliability issues at a much lower cost to ratepayers without damaging the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife Refuge, Scenic Byways and other natural resources;

**I-194-006**

Power lines cause environmental harm: visual impacts, noise, magnetic field risks especially on farm lands, decline in property values, fragmentation of habitat, risks to endangered and rare species, bird mortality along the Mississippi Flyway, and an increase in cancer especially childhood leukemia as a result of electromagnetic fields.

**I-194-002**

The environmental consequences of coal and coal pollution due to this line need to be evaluated. The La Crosse project should be considered with the Brookings and Fargo power lines in making this environmental review

Thank you.  
Sincerely,

**Bernadette Wood**

Dr. Bernadette E. Wood  
23775 Essex Avenue  
Farmington Mn 55024

### **I-194-001**

Your comment has been noted. Alternatives to the project will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

### **I-194-002**

Your comment has been noted. While the CapX2020 projects involve four independent projects being developed in a similar time frame with some of the same of utilities participating, the Purpose and Need for the CapX2020 Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345-kV Project was developed and proven independently of the other CapX2020 projects. The Alternative Evaluation Study addresses project Purpose and Need. It is available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>, which has been approved by the RUS. Purpose and Need and cumulative impacts will also be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

### **I-194-003**

Your comment has been noted. Alternatives to the project will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

### **I-194-004**

Your comment has been noted. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will describe, in detail, project purpose and need. The justification document which has been accepted by the RUS is the Alternative Evaluation study which is available at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>.

### **I-194-005**

Your comment has been noted. Alternatives to the project will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**I-194-006**

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to visual resources, noise, rare species, human health and safety, as well as socioeconomic impacts will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**Kessler, Ellen**

---

**From:** jldupay@netscape.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 19, 2009 8:33 PM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Subject:** CapX20200

July 18, 2009

Dear Ms. Strength,

I've just been informed that the CapX2020 transmission lines are considering W. 50th St. in Webster, Mn for an alternative route.

I'm strongly against this transmission line being installed on W. 50th St. in Webster. The reasons: the health risk posed from the dangerous high voltage electric and magnetic fields, irreversible property devaluation, the effect on dairy production, the wild life environment damage, hazard for small air craft, the constant sound of crackling and humming and what an eye sore.

Please, help us keep this line off W. 50th St. in Webster. Thank you.

Jane DuPay  
3480 W. 50th St.  
Webster, Mn 55088

---

Netscape. Just the Net You Need.

**I-195-001**

This federal scoping process is specific to only the Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345-kV project. As such, we have forwarded your comments to the project team dealing with the project with which you have raised concerns.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**Kessler, Ellen**

---

**From:** suziefox22@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2009 10:30 AM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Subject:** NO,,,, CAPX2020!!!!

Please do not let this happen to my family down in Houston, MN,,,

**I-196-001** | NO to CapX2020.....This is not the thing to do,,,Please stop this,,,

Thanks,

Susan Fox  
[suziefox22@comcast.net](mailto:suziefox22@comcast.net)

## **I-196-001**

Your comment has been noted. Once published the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at:  
<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**Kessler, Ellen**

---

**From:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC [Stephanie.Strength@wdc.usda.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 28, 2009 11:11 AM  
**To:** Lilley, Bliss; Collins, Carly  
**Subject:** FW: Capx2020 comments/EIS

-----Original Message-----

**From:** ruthfood@charter.net [mailto:ruthfood@charter.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 23, 2009 4:51 PM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Subject:** Capx2020 comments/EIS

**I-197-001**

Stephanie,  
Dairyland Power and Xcel Energy must first prove there is a need for new high voltage lines to meet LOCAL need.  
Below are articles showing how the energy company is not being truthful with the rate-payer.  
Xcel just announced a new wind option where rate payers can pay MORE for wind. The problem? energy experts tell us there is no way to deliver just "WIND" generated power to a customer (unless you have your own windmill). The electrons all giggle together regardless of the source. Read further to see how Xcel over charged Colorado rate payers for the same program and faced fines.

**I-197-002**

Bottom line, the utilities motives MUST be analyzed in the process. If the power is to be sent to Chicago and points east in order to profit the utilities, MN and WI tax payers SHOULD NOT pay for this project. Also, CapX will not commit to ANY amount of wind on THEIR lines for the La Crosse Project (Source: MN Public Utilities Commission)  
Thank you for including this information in your decision making process.

<http://www.bizjournals.com/milwaukee/stories/2009/07/20/daily9.html>

Monday, July 20, 2009, 1:52pm CDT

\*Xcel Energy adds wind power option\*

\*The Business Journal of Milwaukee\*

Xcel Energy in Eau Claire said Monday that it has launched a Windsource program that allows Xcel customers to elect to have all or more of their residential or commercial energy generated by renewable resources.

The energy provided for Windsource in Wisconsin during 2009 will be generated from wind farms in Minnesota, South Dakota and North Dakota. Windsource has been ranked as the largest voluntary green power program in the United States for the past six years, and has more than 70,000 residential and 1,000 business customers participating in Minnesota, Colorado and New Mexico.

Since the launch of the Wisconsin program last month, about 190 residential and 10 business customers, such as Northland College in

1

**I-197-001**

Your comment has been noted. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will describe, in detail, project purpose and need. The justification document which has been accepted by the RUS is the Alternative Evaluation study which is available at:  
<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**I-197-002**

Your comment has been noted. Please refer to comment response I-197-001.

Ashland, have signed up to receive some or all of their energy through Windsource, Xcel officials said.

According to Xcel Energy management, Xcel is the top renewable energy provider in Wisconsin and in 2008 about 18 percent of the company's electric generation in the upper Midwest was produced from renewable resources and 43 percent from carbon-free resources.

Windsource costs \$1.15 per 100-kilowatt-hour block above current rates for electricity, with the average residential customer signing up for Windsource seeing an increase of \$12 to their monthly bill. Business and residential customers must agree to be on the program for a one-year term.

"This voluntary rate option gives each and every electric customer throughout our Wisconsin service territory a choice to buy renewable energy and promote the development of wind power," said Steve Mudd, Windsource product manager. "It is a great option for businesses that want to demonstrate their environmental leadership or even obtain LEED certification points."

#### Comments

Bill Bo <<http://networking.bizjournals.com/Bill2391>> July 21, 2009  
9:16AM EST

Did you know that not only is their NO WIND on CAPX2020 AT ALL except for a small amount on the Brookings line (Fargo/Brookings/Minneapolis-La Crosse = the 3 lines), but there is NO REQUIREMENTS on the Twin Cities line to La Crosse at all?  
And when 'they' said the "allegedly windy" CAPX had no plan of going EAST past La Crosse - why now is American Transmission Company going to build the La Crosse to Madison Line? Tourism, Hwy 60, and scenic byways? Ha-hysterical! Getting it yet? Best of all - can you tell when the lights go on if its wind, coal or nuclear you are getting? HERE IS THE NEXT PHASE to Madtown:  
<http://www.tradingmarkets.com/.site/news/Stock%20News/2409577/> and also see <http://nocapx2020.info/?p=593>  
\*\*\*\*\*

"In politics, an organized minority is a political majority." Jesse Jackson

Report Abuse  
<<http://networking.bizjournals.com/community/app/templates/tptemail.aspx?tpt=reportcomment&title=Xcel%20Energy%20adds%20wind%20power%20option&date=July%2021,%202009&author=Bill%20Bo&link=http://milwaukee.bizjournals.com/milwaukee/stories/2009/07/20/daily9.html&mid=7B2BB7B602-5D61-4042-9D60-09698440B30F%7D>>

Bill Bo <<http://networking.bizjournals.com/Bill2391>> July 21, 2009  
9:13AM EST

Less impact from the PUBLIC RELATIONS machine ~ Denver "JANUARY 2009 - WIND PROBE - Xcel eyes deal when ACCUSED of selling more wind power than it generated. Xcel's voluntary wind- energy program will use \$2.6 million in shareholder money for a proposed SETTLEMENT following a STATE INVESTIGATION into the utility's voluntary wind- energy program. ....Xcel will REFUND \$1.6 million this year to "Windsource" customers and spend another \$1 million to purchase renewable-energy credits that will ensure customers receive the alternative power for which they pay a premium

price. The settlement is subject to approval by the Colorado Public Utilities Commission. An investigation last year by PUC staff found that Xcel was selling more power than it generated from Windsource, a program in which customers voluntarily pay a surcharge to support development of renewable energy." [http://www.denverpost.com/business/ci\\_11410889](http://www.denverpost.com/business/ci_11410889)

"The two greatest obstacles to democracy in the United States are, first, the widespread delusion among the poor that we have a democracy, and second, the chronic terror among the rich, lest we get it." [1941] Edward Dowling

Report Abuse  
<<http://networking.bizjournals.com/community/app/templates/tptemail.aspx?tpt=reportcomment&title=Xcel%20Energy%20adds%20wind%20power%20option&date=July%2021,%202009&author=Bill%20Bo&link=http://milwaukee.bizjournals.com/milwaukee/stories/2009/07/20/daily9.html&mid=%7B5683D07C-AB3E-414E-AF8E-2A52E1EC1D76%7D>>

Bill Bo <<http://networking.bizjournals.com/Bill12391>> July 21, 2009  
9:11AM EST

IF \$12 a month gave you part "OWNERSHIP" in the entire "smart grid" (which incidentally, these lines may not be the that new technology) and a "claim stake" to local/regional clean energy - so one day your kids would in fact own it...would you pay it then? I would instantly! But that's the very last thing on earth the utilities want. Question: Could these dollars from this "greenish wind" program be going to ADVERTISING & PR expenses "selling us" on what they want us thinking they are doing with wind in the first place? Is Doyle involved? Oh - and that's just CAPX - there is ANOTHER one coming to WI - GREEN POWER EXPRESS! SEE <http://legalelectric.org/weblog/2900/>

"Politicians are the same all over. They promise to build a bridge even where there is no river" Nikita Krushchev

[http://www.denverpost.com/business/ci\\_11410889#comments](http://www.denverpost.com/business/ci_11410889#comments)

Xcel eyes deal in wind probe

The utility proposes a \$2.6 million settlement after it was accused of selling more wind power than it generated.

\*By Steve Raabe \*  
/The Denver Post/  
<<mailto:sraabe@denverpost.com?subject=The%20Denver%20Post:%20Xcel%20eyes%20deal%20in%20wind%20probe>>

Posted: 01/09/2009 12:30:00 AM MST

Related

\* Dec 25:



\* Report: Xcel plan oversold in 2008  
 <[http://www.denverpost.com/business/ci\\_11306709](http://www.denverpost.com/business/ci_11306709)>  
 \* Dec 24:  
 \* Xcel must honor the public trust  
 <[http://www.denverpost.com/business/ci\\_11298121](http://www.denverpost.com/business/ci_11298121)>  
 \* Dec 23:  
 \* Xcel overbilled for wind plan  
 <[http://www.denverpost.com/business/ci\\_11291714](http://www.denverpost.com/business/ci_11291714)>  
 \*

Xcel Energy will use \$2.6 million in shareholder money for a proposed settlement following a state investigation into the utility's voluntary wind- energy program.

Under the pending agreement, Xcel will refund \$1.6 million this year to Windsource customers and spend another \$1 million to purchase renewable-energy credits that will ensure customers receive the alternative power for which they pay a premium price.

The settlement is subject to approval by the Colorado Public Utilities Commission.

An investigation last year by PUC staff found that Xcel was selling more power than it generated from Windsource, a program in which customers voluntarily pay a surcharge to support development of renewable energy.

The settlement enables Xcel to use its entire portfolio of renewable energy to sell to Windsource customers, instead of just the two relatively small wind farms in northern Colorado that originally were designated for Windsource.

As a result, the program will be able to grow beyond its current sold-out capacity of 47,000 customers.

"The benefit is that it allows more customers to participate and it allows more development of renewable energy," said John Nielsen, energy-program director of Western Resource Advocates, a Boulder-based research group that helped draft the settlement.

For an average household that buys all its power from Windsource, Xcel's \$1.6 million refund would lower the extra cost from about \$35 a month to \$23, on top of normal power rates.

"This removes a great deal of uncertainty about the viability of Colorado consumers' access to renewables," said Arthur O'Donnell of green-power certification firm Green-e Energy.

The refund will be paid through 2009. Starting in 2010, Windsource rates will be based on the cost to build and acquire new renewable energy, which could result in higher Windsource premiums, Nielsen said.

/Steve Raabe: 303-954-1948 or [sraabe@denverpost.com](mailto:sraabe@denverpost.com)  
 <<mailto:sraabe@denverpost.com>>/

\*Article Comments (2)  
 <<http://neighbors.denverpost.com/viewtopic.php?t=11410889>> \*

\*You must be registered to comment\* (your comment will be saved for you while you register). It's quick (it takes about 30 seconds) and we only require your email and name. Comments that include any offensive material <<http://neighbors.denverpost.com/groundrules.php>> are prohibited. By using our site you agree to our terms of use <<http://www.denverpost.com/termsfuse>>.

Enron?

<<http://neighbors.denverpost.com/memberlist.php?mode=viewprofile&u=11686>>

\*Gary L Warn

<<http://neighbors.denverpost.com/memberlist.php?mode=viewprofile&u=11686>>\*

Joined: Sep 26

Points: 226 Permanent link to this comment

<<http://neighbors.denverpost.com/viewtopic.php?p=626946#p626946>>Gary L

Warn

<<http://neighbors.denverpost.com/memberlist.php?mode=viewprofile&u=11686>>

(aka Graybeard) | 2:44 PM on Friday Jan 9 Vote up

<[http://neighbors.denverpost.com/viewtopic.php?p=626946&postvote=up&no\\_increase\\_views=1#p626946](http://neighbors.denverpost.com/viewtopic.php?p=626946&postvote=up&no_increase_views=1#p626946)>

Vote down

<[http://neighbors.denverpost.com/viewtopic.php?p=626946&postvote=down&no\\_increase\\_views=1#p626946](http://neighbors.denverpost.com/viewtopic.php?p=626946&postvote=down&no_increase_views=1#p626946)>(must

be logged in <<http://neighbors.denverpost.com/ucp.php?mode=login>> to

vote) Report Abuse

<[http://neighbors.denverpost.com/abuse\\_report.php?626946](http://neighbors.denverpost.com/abuse_report.php?626946)>

/Xcel Energy will use \$2.6 million in shareholder money for a proposed settlement following a state investigation into the utility's voluntary wind- energy program.

/

/Under the pending agreement, Xcel will refund \$1.6 million this year to Windsource customers and spend another \$1 million to purchase renewable-energy credits that will ensure customers receive the alternative power for which the.../

> View all this article's 2 comments

<<http://neighbors.denverpost.com/viewtopic.php?t=11410889>>

---

**Kessler, Ellen**

---

**From:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC [Stephanie.Strength@wdc.usda.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 28, 2009 11:08 AM  
**To:** Lilley, Bliss; Collins, Carly  
**Subject:** FW:

---

**From:** joanfrancois@acegroup.cc [mailto:joanfrancois@acegroup.cc]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 23, 2009 3:12 PM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Subject:**

I am writing as a concerned citizen about the environment. I feel that the needs for the future need careful evaluation and that we don't have to continue thinking that bigger is better. We need to think outside the box when it comes to energy resources. So please consider local-renewable-cost effective ideas. Thanks Joan Francois La Crescent, MN

I-198-001 |

## I-198-001

Your comment has been noted. Alternatives to the project will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**Kessler, Ellen**

---

**From:** GJBJackson@aol.com  
**Sent:** Friday, July 24, 2009 9:36 AM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Subject:** CapX2020 ultra high voltage power line projects

Stephanie,

- I-199-003** | I read with dismay the point that Dairyland Power does not want to pay their portion of CapX and would like the taxpayers to cover the cost. I am very much against this tax burden. We are very much overburdened
- I-199-001** | with tax responsibilities now and forthcoming with the new administration. The forecasts of electric peak demand do not support the need for the CapX2020 ultra high voltage power line projects, including the La Crosse Project.
- I-199-004** | The environmental consequences of coal and coal pollution due to the La Crosse line will result in additional adverse impacts of the project. Other adverse affects are visual impacts in scenic corridors, health risks due to electro-magnetic fields, decline in property values, loss of prime agricultural land, risks to rare and endangered species, fragmentation of habitat in a national wildlife refuge, and bird mortality along the Mississippi
- I-199-002** | Flyway.Conservation, local generation and local transmission can solve any local reliability issues at a much lower cost to Rateplayers without damaging the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife Refuge, Scenic Byways and other protected natural resources that would be impaired by the La Crosse Project and without providing transmission from distant coal plants.

Is this another rush and push for a project that has not been given adequate thought, consideration and validity to workable alternatives.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gloria Belzer

---

**I-199-001**

Your comment has been noted. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will describe, in detail, project purpose and need. The justification document which has been accepted by the RUS is the Alternative Evaluation study which is available at:  
<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**I-199-002**

Your comment has been noted. Alternatives to the project will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**I-199-003**

Your comment has been noted. Dairyland Power Cooperative, one of the CapX2020 utilities, has requested financial assistance from USDA Rural Utilities Service (RUS), for Dairyland's anticipated 11 percent ownership interest in the proposed Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345 kilovolt transmission line project. RUS has determined that its funding of Dairyland's ownership interest is a federal action and therefore subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). RUS is the lead agency for both NEPA and Section 106 review.

**I-199-004**

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to human and livestock health and safety with regard to EMF, visual resources, socioeconomic issues including property values, rare species, and

agricultural resources will all be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**Kessler, Ellen**

**From:** Custer Nilsson [custernilsson@ridge-runner.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 24, 2009 4:50 PM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Subject:** Comments re: CAPX2020

The CAPX2020 transmission line designed to primarily serve communities surrounding Rochester, MN and La Crosse, WI should not be routed through rural areas in Trempealeau County, WI. In May of 2009 residents of Trempealeau County were informed that two new 'alternate' routes had been developed for the CAPX2020 transmission line. Both of the new routes traverse wide swaths of Trempealeau County. JUNE 2009 WAS THE FIRST TIME WE WERE INFORMED THAT NEW ROUTES WERE BEING CONSIDERED NEAR OUR HOMES.

**I-200-001**

Residents along all other routes had been informed over a year earlier and had been given the opportunity to impact initial decisions about proposed routes. This opportunity was denied to citizens along the new routes in Trempealeau County.

We are poor - \*see per capita income below - we are few - \*see population data below and we were not given equal opportunity to impact early decisions about these transmission routes. This process has put citizens of Trempealeau County at a distinct disadvantage.

**I-200-002**

**I-200-003**

At no time in all the years of planning leading up to this process did Dairyland Power or Riverland Energy inform rate payers that new transmission lines could be placed in the rural areas of Trempealeau County that are bisected by the new routes.

The transmission lines should be placed near those population centers that are creating the need - don't destroy our rural landscape. Taking the route through our heavily wooded and agricultural lands will destroy hundreds of trees at a time when an increase of carbon monoxide in our atmosphere threatens life on our planet. Rural wooded lands such as ours should be preserved, not destroyed.

Why are the transmissions lines being routed around the city of Rochester, MN? Did the influence of Rochester area businesses and the Mayo Clinic give them special access to route planners? None of the proposed routes go near that city, yet that is the largest population area to be served by this project.

At the June meeting representatives of the project stated that they wanted to place the lines away from population centers - away from people.

Guess what, the citizens of rural Trempealeau County are people too. We choose to live in a rural environment for a reason, and we pay premium prices for the privilege. We pay more for all basic services like electricity and transportation. We receive less state and federal support for our infrastructure. We don't even have the broadband Internet access that is needed to open your files on the transmission line reports. That's okay, we accept less services as part of our choice to live in a rural area. But our choice does not include living under the transmission lines that are required to provide a better quality of life for people in urban area. If urban centers want a better quality of life they should live with the cost and consequences of that choice.

**I-200-004**

These lines will do nothing to improve the electric service in our area. Many of us live with poor service, constant fluctuation in power and regular power outages. These new transmission lines will in no way improve the delivery of electricity to our rural lanes.

Routing these lines through rural Trempealeau County is the most expensive option being considered. It is clear that these routes are only being considered because we can't scream as loud as the urban population centers and we have less influence on the decision makers. I urge you to deny funding to Dairyland Power and Riverland Energy for the purpose of building the CAPX2020 transmission lines through rural Trempealeau County.

Per capita and Population  
County

Per capita 1999 per US census

**I-200-001**

Your comment has been noted. The criteria used to route the transmission line is described in the Macro Corridor Study which is available on the RUS website at:

<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. These criteria and routing process will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The project is still in the development and planning stages and the utilities have not yet permitted a route for the transmission line. The utilities are striving to provide the most up to date information in a timely manner. Project information is updated regularly on the project website, [www.capx2020.com](http://www.capx2020.com).

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**I-200-002**

Your comment has been noted. The criteria used to route the transmission line is described in the Macro Corridor Study which is available on the RUS website at:

<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. These criteria and routing process will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The project is still in the development and planning stages and the utilities have not yet permitted a route for the transmission line.

**I-200-003**

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to vegetation will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Population 2008 estimate per US census

Trempealeau Cty. WI

\$17,681

27,790

La Crosse Cty. WI

\$19,800

112,627

Olmsted Cty. MN

\$24,939

141,360

NOTE: The combined population of La Crosse and Olmsted counties is nine (9) times greater than Trempealeau County. What is the likelihood that the voices of Trempealeau County citizens will carry the same weight in this discussion? We have already been put at a significant disadvantage in this discussion because planners did not consult us until May 2009 – all others were consulted repeatedly over a year ago.

Put the power lines by the people who will be using them, not by rural people who have no representation and will not benefit from this project.

Cristeen Custer  
N18585 Hammond Lane  
Galesville, WI 54630

## **I-200-004**

Your comment has been noted. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will describe, in detail, project purpose and need. The justification document which has been accepted by the RUS is the Alternative Evaluation study which is available at:  
<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>.

**Kessler, Ellen**

---

**From:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC [Stephanie.Strength@wdc.usda.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 28, 2009 11:18 AM  
**To:** Lilley, Bliss; Collins, Carly  
**Subject:** FW: CapX2020 ultra high voltage power line

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Daley.Nancy@MacPhail.org [mailto:Daley.Nancy@MacPhail.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 24, 2009 10:05 AM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Subject:** CapX2020 ultra high voltage power line

To whom it may concern,

We oppose this project for the following reasons:

**I-201-001**

1. Updated forecasts of electric peak demand do not support the need for the CapX2020 ultra high voltage power line projects, including the La Crosse Project;

**I-201-002**

2. The CapX2020 La Crosse ultra high voltage power line will cause environmental harm -- including visual impacts in scenic corridors, health risks due to electro-magnetic fields, decline in property values, loss of prime agricultural land, risks to rare and endangered species, fragmentation of habitat in a national wildlife refuge, and bird mortality along the Mississippi Flyway.

Nancy and Kevin Daley

**I-201-001**

Your comment has been noted. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will describe, in detail, project purpose and need. The justification document which has been accepted by the RUS is the Alternative Evaluation study which is available at:  
<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**I-201-002**

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to human and livestock health and safety with regard to EMF, visual resources, socioeconomic issues including property values, rare species, and agricultural resources will all be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.



**Kessler, Ellen**

**From:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC [Stephanie.Strength@wdc.usda.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 28, 2009 11:17 AM  
**To:** Lilley, Bliss; Collins, Carly  
**Subject:** FW: Comment on USDA/RUS EIS for CapX2020 La Crosse Project

**Importance:** High

---

**From:** jtrodude@charter.net [mailto:jtrodude@charter.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 24, 2009 9:13 AM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Subject:** Comment on USDA/RUS EIS for CapX2020 La Crosse Project  
**Importance:** High

Dear Ms. Strength:

Below are my comments, concerns and perspectives on the USDA/RUS EIS for the CapX2020 La Crosse Project. I am a concerned citizen who lives in La Crescent, MN and works as a natural resource professional in La Crosse, WI, so I see the issue from both sides of the state line. I think if Maryland Power's request is granted, it will result in unsound environmental policy along a number of fronts (wildlife conservation, recreation and aesthetics, and possibly most important, additional greenhouse gases from the coal power generation it will enable in the Dakotas), as well as generating additional unfair and unjustified expenses to taxpayers. Below is a summary of key points to include in the comments on the EIS. We need to put any resources we have into localizing the existing power grid to modernize it. We do NOT need to be transmitting power inefficiently across vast distances with power lines that are potential health risks to humans and animals and disrupt migration and the scenic landscape. There are much better alternatives now available to distribute electrical power and we should be putting our resources into developing those, not what CapX2020 in general is proposing.

- I-202-001** | 1. Updated forecasts of electric peak demand do not support the need for the CapX2020 ultra high voltage power line projects, including the La Crosse Project;
- I-202-002** | 2. The CapX2020 La Crosse ultra high voltage power line will cause environmental harm -- including visual impacts in scenic corridors, health risks due to electro-magnetic fields, decline in property values, loss of prime agricultural land, risks to rare and endangered species, fragmentation of habitat in a national wildlife refuge, and bird mortality along the Mississippi flyway.
- I-202-003** | 3. The La Crosse Project should be considered with other CapX2020 power lines which create the potential for transmission of coal power east from the Dakotas to load centers east of Minnesota. The environmental consequences of coal and coal pollution due to the La Crosse line result in additional adverse impacts of the project.
- I-202-004** | 4. Conservation, local generation and local transmission can solve any local reliability issues at a much lower cost to ratepayers without damaging the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife Refuge, Scenic Byways and other protected natural resources that would be impaired by the La Crosse Project and without providing transmission from distant coal plants;
- I-202-005** | 5. Taxpayers should not finance any portion of the CapX2020 La Crosse Project through the USDA Rural Utilities Service.

Thank you for your time and for incorporating my comments into the EIS.

1

**I-202-001**

Your comment has been noted. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will describe, in detail, project purpose and need. The justification document which has been accepted by the RUS is the Alternative Evaluation study which is available at:  
<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**I-202-002**

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to human and livestock health and safety with regard to EMF, visual resources, socioeconomic issues including property values, rare species, and agricultural resources will all be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**I-202-003**

Your comment has been noted. Due to the transmission grid's interconnected nature as well as to electricity's nature - it's generally difficult to identify a specific source of electricity on the grid.

The proposed CapX2020 transmission lines will serve the region's expected growth and help begin to meet Minnesota's Renewable Energy Standard (RES), which requires utilities to deliver 25 percent of their electricity from renewable sources by 2025 (Xcel Energy is mandated to deliver 30 percent by 2020, with 25 percent from wind). Most of that energy comes from wind turbines.

**I-202-004**

Jeanne T. (Terry) Dukerschein  
1206 Juniper St.  
La Crescent, MN 55947

Your comment has been noted. Alternatives to the project will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**I-202-005**

Your comment has been noted. Dairyland Power Cooperative, one of the CapX2020 utilities, has requested financial assistance from USDA Rural Utilities Service (RUS), for Dairyland's anticipated 11 percent ownership interest in the proposed Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345 kilovolt transmission line project. RUS has determined that its funding of Dairyland's ownership interest is a federal action and therefore subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). RUS is the lead agency for both NEPA and Section 106 review.

---

**Kessler, Ellen**

---

**From:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC [Stephanie.Strength@wdc.usda.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 28, 2009 11:05 AM  
**To:** Lilley, Bliss; Collins, Carly  
**Subject:** FW: CapX2020 Project in Minnesota  
**Attachments:** SkyHarborAirpark.jpg

---

From: ryanflicek@yahoo.com [mailto:ryanflicek@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2009 12:04 PM  
To: Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
Subject: CapX2020 Project in Minnesota

Hello Stephanie,

I'm a Rice County, Minnesota resident and have been reviewing those documents regarding the Brookings Co to Hampton Transmission line (part of the CapX2020 Project) on the Minnesota State website.

I have read about one of the alternative Rice County routes that is being included in the Environmental Assessment. As a local pilot, I can tell you because of Sky Harbor Airpark, an airport located just north of 50<sup>th</sup> St West, the alternative route should NOT have been accepted for review. If this proposed alternative route was to be used, the approach path to Runway 30 at Sky Harbor would be severely compromised, causing a significant safety hazard for landing aircraft.

Both the 57<sup>th</sup> St W and the 50<sup>th</sup> St W options pose a significant danger to Sky Harbor air traffic, however the 50<sup>th</sup> St W option would definitely pose more danger. Some people with a naïve understanding of airport operations may simply suggest a change to the traffic pattern, however the problem is much more complex. A much more critical consideration is the safety of the approach/departure surfaces off the end of the runway. Under the 50<sup>th</sup> ST W option, if we were conducting an FAA approach/departure obstruction survey on the RWY 30 approach-end at Sky Harbor, the proposed transmission line would fall within the limits of the FAA-approach-surface used for evaluation. At its closest point, the transmission line would fall within 0.5 miles of the runway end. On a straight-out departure, the transmission line would cross the approach surface approx 1-mile from-runway-end. At a 40:1 approach/departure slope, an object higher than approx 65 feet would penetrate the approach/departure surface at the 0.5 mile point. At the 1-mile point, an object higher than approx. 130 feet would penetrate the approach/departure surface. As I understand it, the transmission lines would be approx 150 feet tall. So, just running quick-and-dirty numbers, the transmission line would definitely constitute an "obstruction" as it relates to aviation.

Sky Harbor Airpark is a destination which welcomes many visiting pilots and large gatherings/fly-ins. Because the Runway is grass (not asphalt) at Sky Harbor, many curious visiting pilots are attracted to the area (grass runways are becoming more rare). These transmission lines would pose the increased risk to visiting pilots, not as accustomed to the area as local pilots. Because it is a private field, pre-flight information regarding Sky Harbor is not as readily available to pilots as it would be for an FAA-governed airport, such as a Municipal, Regional, or International airports. Thus, I am worried that the status of new transmission lines in this area may not adequately be disseminated to pilots. This danger would rise exponentially when you factor in flight operations occurring at night or in conditions involving reduced visibility.

Because of the short length of the runway at Sky Harbor, traffic patterns are often flown much lower than standard. Furthermore, in addition to many normally certificated aircraft, Sky Harbor is home to many Ultra-Light Aircraft as well. The normal operating altitudes of these types of aircraft is much lower than those of normally certificated aircraft. The performance characteristics of these aircraft make them less capable of making abrupt flight maneuvers to avoid collision with obstacles, should a pilot accidentally find themselves too close to these obstacles. There are also a few Sky Harbor residents that operate helicopters, which often depart and approach

## I-203-001

This federal scoping process is specific to only the Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345-kV project. As such, we have forwarded your comments to the project team dealing with the project with which you have raised concerns.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**the area at altitudes much lower than fixed-wing aircraft.**

**All-in-all, as a pilot, flight instructor, and professional in an aviation-safety industry, I know that there are far too many safety-risks pilots already encounter on a day-to-day basis. By erecting these transmission lines, it would be unfairly imposing another great risk to safety on these pilots, further complicating their operations.**

Attached to this email is an aerial photo showing the proposed route of the transmission line (in green) and the runway (in red). For your orientation, this location is just a couple miles southeast of Webster, Minnesota.

Thank you.

Ryan Flicek

206 10th Ave NW

Lonsdale, MN 55046

507-581-3519





**Kessler, Ellen**

**From:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC [Stephanie.Strength@wdc.usda.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 28, 2009 11:12 AM  
**To:** Lilley, Bliss; Collins, Carly  
**Subject:** FW: CapX2020/USDA/RUS comments  
**Attachments:** Attached Message Part; Attached Message Part

-----Original Message-----

From: ruthfood@charter.net [mailto:ruthfood@charter.net]  
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 4:56 PM  
To: Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
Subject: CapX2020/USDA/RUS comments

Ms. Strength,  
Additional comments:

Please question the LOCAL need for CapX and consider the NO BUILD option.

Per Carol Overland, Attorney:  
in MN: Remember we have 1,900 MW of wind, and that we could shut down  
900MW of coal right now based on Xcel's demand alone... and almost shut  
down Prairie Island! Monticello nuclear is 600 MW, we could shut that down!

The question to ask the utilities is:

Why do you claim we "need" new generation?  
Why do you imply/assume we can't shut down fossil fuel or nuclear fuel now?  
Why do you state there are NO alternatives to your project ( See the  
wind info. above)

**I-204-001** DEMANDS HAS DROPPED - HERE IS the Evidence:\*

Xcel's 2008 10-K filed February 23, 2009  
<<http://investing.businessweek.com/research/stocks/financials/drawFiling.asp?docKey=136-000104746909002013-6PNAQ1ITEM17MR5OD3T090RE08&docFormat=HTM&formType=10-K>>

From their 10-k, p. 10:

\* Capacity and Demand

\*

Uninterrupted system peak demand for the NSP System's electric  
utility for each of the last three years and the forecast for 2009,  
assuming normal weather, is listed below.

System Peak Demand (in MW)			
2006	2007	2008	2009 Forecast
9,859	9,427	8,697	9,662

-----

**I-204-001**

Your comment has been noted. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will describe, in detail, project purpose and need. The justification document which has been accepted by the RUS is the Alternative Evaluation study which is available at:  
<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**Kessler, Ellen**

---

**From:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC [Stephanie.Strength@wdc.usda.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 28, 2009 11:18 AM  
**To:** Lilley, Bliss; Collins, Carly  
**Subject:** FW: CAPX2020  
**Attachments:** 3475\_001.pdf

-----Original Message-----

From: rfuhrmann@integra.net [mailto:rfuhrmann@integra.net]  
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2009 10:27 AM  
To: scott.ek@state.mn.us; Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
Subject: CAPX2020

Please see my attached comments.

Thank you

Roy Fuhrmann  
3161 Cass Trail  
Webster, MN 55088

**I-205-001**

This federal scoping process is specific to only the Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345-kV project. As such, we have forwarded your comments to the project team dealing with the project with which you have raised concerns.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

July 23, 2009

Mr. Scott Ek  
Office of Energy Security and  
Energy Facility Permitting  
85 7<sup>th</sup> Place East  
Suite 500  
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

Ms. Stephanie Strength  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
USDA, Rural Utilities Service  
Engineering and Environmental Staff  
1400 Independence Ave. SW, Stop 1571  
Washington, DC 20250-1571

Re: CAPX2020

Dear Mr. Ek and Ms. Strength:

I have reviewed the proposed alignment options for the CAPX2020 Transmission line and offer the following comments concerning the alignment of Alternative A-RIC-003 in Rice County, Minnesota:

Sky Harbor Airpark is a private residential airpark located on the southwest corner of the intersections of Canby Ave and Rice County 3, one mile east of the city of Webster. The Airpark is home to over 50 based aircraft and 46 homes and has a southeast/northwest runway, Runway 12/30, which is 2,855 feet long.

Minnesota Statute 360.062 Airport Hazard Prevention, states that "an airport hazard endangers the lives and property of users of the airport and of occupants of land in its vicinity". Minnesota Rules, Chapter 8800.1200 Criteria For Determining Air Navigation Obstructions, defines obstructions to air navigation. As defined in Chapter 8800.1200, Subp. 5, B. the Horizontal Surface is an imaginary horizontal plane 150 feet above the established airport elevation and extends in a 5,000 feet arc around the primary surface of the runway.

The proposed Alternate A-RIC-003 alignment is approximately 2,600 feet from Sky Harbor Airpark's Runway 12/30. The transmission line towers are described as being 170 feet tall and therefore they will penetrate the above described Horizontal Surface, be within the 5,000 foot arc from the runway and therefore be considered an Air Navigation Obstruction. Additional analysis needs to be completed to determine if the Alternative A-RIC-003 alignment penetrates any of the Primary Approach Surfaces to Runway 12/30 at Sky Harbor Airpark.

Finally, given the known location of the Airpark any transmission lines located on an approach path or within one mile of an airport should be appropriately lighted and safety balls should be placed on the transmission lines to prevent potential accidents. I ask that you consider the above information as part of your alignment selection process.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed CAPX2020 alignment. If you have any questions, please contact me at 612-384-7973.

Sincerely,



Roy Fuhrmann  
3161 Cass Trail  
Webster, MN 55088



**Kessler, Ellen**

**From:** Andrew Gilmer [gilmermac@mac.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 24, 2009 9:39 PM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Subject:** Capx2020

Dear Ms. Strength,

I am concerned with CapX2020's plan to install new transmissions lines across MN. I recognize that the country's energy needs need to be addressed and that doing so may require new infrastructure to be built. This is not a "not in my backyard" situation. I am asking for the public to be given a choice after an independent fact finding study with reasonable assumptions has been accomplished. A study that demonstrates the future need for power, while considering a spectrum of options. These options should include improvements to energy efficiency, reduction in per capita energy consumption, off the grid technologies and distributed generation. Only after a thorough study is accomplished should we take action that is on scale with CapX2020's plans. In addition, if such an "improvement" in infrastructure is required, care should be made to place that infrastructure along already established lines of communication. For example routing the lines along the I94 and I90 corridors and established bridges vs. ruining pristine bluff country in SE MN and placing new high tension lines across the Mississippi. While this would cost more it would minimize the impact on both the beauty of the land and potential harmful impact on bird species found along the Mississippi and the threatened Eastern rattle snake habitat in SE MN. The local citizen should be given a voice in how their power is generated and routed. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Andrew Gilmer

I-206-001

I-206-003

I-206-002

**I-206-002**

The project is still in the development and planning stages and the utilities are striving to provide the most up to date information in a timely manner. Project information is updated regularly on the project website, [www.capx2020.com](http://www.capx2020.com).

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**I-206-003**

Your comment has been noted. The criteria used to route the transmission line is described in the Macro Corridor Study which is available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. These criteria and routing process will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The project is still in the development and planning stages and the utilities have not yet permitted a route for the transmission line.

**Kessler, Ellen**

**From:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC [Stephanie.Strength@wdc.usda.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 28, 2009 11:14 AM  
**To:** Lilley, Bliss; Collins, Carly  
**Subject:** FW: CAP X powerline

---

**From:** blgregers@myclearwave.net [mailto:blgregers@myclearwave.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 23, 2009 7:47 PM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Subject:** CAP X powerline

Stephanie A. Strength  
Environmental Protection Specialist/RD  
1400 Independence Ave. SW Room # 2244  
Washington, DC 20250-1571

I write to you with my concerns for the CAP X2020 power line that is being proposed to go from the Dakota and ultimately end up in Chicago. I am sure that you have read them all, but I would like to state my concerns.

**I-207-001**

1. I understand that the current updated forecasts of electric peak demand do not support the need for ultra high voltage power lines -- including the LaCrosse Project. If we don't need them, then why build these kind of lines -- we can't afford to do business as usual and just build or buy things like we used to do. The money is not there.

**I-207-002****I-207-004**

2. I have a real concern about the environmental damage that will occur from coal and the pollution it causes. There is no "clean coal power." Why are we using this kind of energy source when there are much more environmentally sound ones. Please don't do this. We only have one world and we are responsible to leave it a better place for our children and grandchildren. Please consider how the entire project will cause pollution.

3. Let's not further damage the environment and protected national wildlife refuge by putting this kind of power line in the places where we have already declared it to be a refuge. There are so many other ways to do this and at a much lower cost. Don't continue the fallacy of going with what we know. Let leave this world a better place for our children. Let us not damage or destroy the environment so that we have children who do not know the beauty of the land without power lines overhead.

**I-207-003**

4. Please do not put further burdens on already financially strapped people by asking them to pay for utility lines that they will receive no benefit from -- not to mention that their property value will decrease with a high voltage power line on it.

In this past couple of years, we have been the victim of so many greedy corporations who have no regard for the "little" people. They don't care who gets hurt as long as they get their way or their money. Well, we are in a financial crisis in this country because of that greed. Maybe you should listen to the "little" people who kept their head on straight and did not over extend themselves or did not get greedy. We are the backbone of this country and are paying for that greed. Please don't let the power companies the comprise CAPX2020 take advantage of the "little" people. We don't need to get hit again.

Thank you for your time.

Linda Gregerson  
Northfield, MN

**I-207-005**

5. Taxpayers should not finance any portion of the the CapX2020 La Crosse Project through the USDA Rural Utilities Service.

**I-207-001**

Your comment has been noted. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will describe, in detail, project purpose and need. The justification document which has been accepted by the RUS is the Alternative Evaluation study which is available at:  
<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**I-207-002**

Your comment has been noted. Due to the transmission grid's interconnected nature as well as to electricity's nature - it's generally difficult to identify a specific source of electricity on the grid.

The proposed CapX2020 transmission lines will serve the region's expected growth and help begin to meet Minnesota's Renewable Energy Standard (RES), which requires utilities to deliver 25 percent of their electricity from renewable sources by 2025 (Xcel Energy is mandated to deliver 30 percent by 2020, with 25 percent from wind). Most of that energy comes from wind turbines.

Cumulative Impacts will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**I-207-003**

Your comment has been noted. Socioeconomic impacts to property values affected by the transmission line will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**I-207-004**

Your comment has been noted. Alternatives to the project will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**I-207-005**

Your comment has been noted. Dairyland Power Cooperative, one of the CapX2020 utilities, has requested financial assistance from USDA Rural Utilities Service (RUS), for Dairyland's anticipated 11 percent ownership interest in the proposed Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345 kilovolt transmission line project. RUS has determined that its funding of Dairyland's ownership interest is a federal action and therefore subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). RUS is the lead agency for both NEPA and Section 106 review.

**Kessler, Ellen**

---

**From:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC [Stephanie.Strength@wdc.usda.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 28, 2009 1:10 PM  
**To:** Lilley, Bliss; Collins, Carly  
**Subject:** FW: Attached Files mailed Comment Form Puboic Scoping Meetings. Thank you.  
**Attachments:** Barb Hammes.vcf; Email0134.jpg; Email0135.jpg; Email0136.jpg

---

From: bbhammes@acegroup.cc [mailto:bbhammes@acegroup.cc]  
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 4:31 PM  
To: Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
Cc: bjhammes@gundluth.org  
Subject: Attached Files mailed Comment Form Puboic Scoping Meetings. Thank you.

In your opinion, was the project description, purpose, and need for the project adequately explained? If not, what additional information is needed?

I-208-002

We understand the need was not adequately addressed by the process in MN.

Please tell us how to reach you.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Name: Bernard Hammes  
Representing (Optional): Barbara Hammes - property owner  
Mailing Address: Mississippi River Wild (Refuge Friends  
314 Shore Acres Rd. Group  
City: La Crescent State: MN. Zip Code: 55947  
Daytime Phone (Optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Public participation for the Federal, Minnesota, and Wisconsin permitting processes will be ongoing for the Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345 kV Transmission Project. If you sign up for the mailing list, you will be notified when opportunities to participate are being planned.

Please plan to continue your involvement in the process and provide your comments. We appreciate your input.

If you own property in one of the proposed corridors, please indicate all the existing uses of your property below:

- ☐ Agriculture ☒ Residential ☐ Conservation Easement  
☐ Commercial ☐ Industrial ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe any special uses or circumstances on your property that should be considered when assessing the Project. Please indicate the location of your property.

I-208-003 Our Shore Acres MN home property  
fag yearly for river frontage proper  
taxes. Looking directly at the 5-3x  
highest larger tower & lines  
is an eye sore/nuisance which  
would decrease our property  
values & property taxes  
paid.

Our Trempealeau cottage is also on the upper  
Mississippi River Refuge.

In your opinion, what are the most sensitive resources (biological, cultural, recreational,  
etc.) in the Project area and why?

I-208-001 Many river birds (eagles, osprey, <sup>migrates</sup> owl,  
herons, egrets, cormorants, martins etc)  
use the Mississippi River fly  
way. The proposed tower & lines  
are 2-3x higher & larger than  
the existing ones which already  
cause damage & death to  
these birds. We volunteer many hours  
improve & enhance the Upper Mississippi  
River Refuge & do not wish this project  
to cross or be seen on the  
Refuge areas.

#### I-208-001

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to wildlife will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

#### I-208-002

Your comment has been noted. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will describe, in detail, project purpose and need. The justification document which has been accepted by the RUS is the Alternative Evaluation study which is available at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>.

#### I-208-003

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to the aesthetic quality of the areas surrounding the transmission line as well as socioeconomic impacts to property values affected by the transmission line will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

## COMMENT FORM

Public Scoping Meetings

We need your input. Please take a few minutes to provide your comments or questions for the USDA RUS Federal Environmental Impact Statement process and return your completed form today or mail by July 25, 2009. Your comments help in the planning and implementation of the project. **Thank you.**

Completing this form will automatically add you to our mailing list. If you prefer to not be on the mailing list, please check the box below.

☒ I do not wish to be on the project mailing list

Which meeting did you attend? La Crescent, MN.

Please check the following issues that are important to you for transmission line siting.

- ☒ Project Purpose and Need
- ☒ Visual / Aesthetic resources
- ☒ Proximity to residences
- ☒ Land use (agriculture, residential, recreation)
- ☒ Water resources (floodplains, river crossings)
- ☒ Biological resources (wildlife habitat, raptors)
- ☐ Historic and cultural sites
- ☐ Radio or television interference
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Health and safety

I-208-004 ☒ Other: LSE airport proximity issues

What additional key issues should be addressed when assessing the potential impacts of this project?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Hampton • Rochester • La Crosse 345 kV Transmission Project

I-208-004

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to public transportation as well as health and safety will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.



**Kessler, Ellen**

---

**Full Name:** Barb Hammes  
**Last Name:** Hammes  
**First Name:** Barb  
**E-mail:** bbhammes@acegroup.cc  
**E-mail Display As:** Barb Hammes (bbhammes@acegroup.cc)



**Kessler, Ellen**

**From:** chelmlberger@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Monday, July 27, 2009 2:04 PM  
**To:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
**Subject:** Fw: Powerlines: South Dakota through Minnesota (Hampton, Rochester) to LaCrosse, Wisconsin

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hello,  
Stephanie, I submitted this to you on 6/29 but wanted to be sure that you received it.

Please read the entire email of mine below but in short:

- I-209-001** | 1. This is a massive project through South Dakota, Minnesota and Wisconsin - it is not just a segment from Hampton to LaCrosse.
- I-209-002** | 2. This is a huge financial impact to people whose land and homes will be devalued.
- I-209-003** | 3. There are existing rights of way that the power companies can use and they choose not to do this. Using existing lines would be less disruptive to families and ag land and acreage land.
- 4. Excel Energy has about 44 full time lobbyists at the Minnesota Capitol. Yet the 22,000 plus individuals directly impacted as their land has to be given up( so you can imagine how many indirectly are impacted -ie their home is within a short distance of the powerlines) are just a whisper. Please do NOT let the big guys get there way on this. You must know that 22,000 canNOT be in favor of these powerlines.
- I-209-005** | 5. There needs to be more research on if there really is the need for these massive powerlines. If these go in, they will double and triple over time.
- I-209-004** | 6. One can only think that we in Minnesota and Wisconsin will have our land taken from us for pennies compared to what it is worth only to let these lines bring power to other states way east of here.

Thank you,  
Cindy Helmlberger

----- Forwarded Message -----  
**From:** Cindy Helmlberger <chelmlberger@yahoo.com>  
**To:** stephanie.strength@usda.gov  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2009 2:52:19 PM  
**Subject:** Powerlines: South Dakota through Minnesota (Hampton, Rochester) to LaCrosse, Wisconsin

Hello,  
I am writing regarding the large multi-faceted powerline project from South Dakota to Minnesota to Wisconsin.

If I may please ask that you email me back that you received my email, I would appreciate it

ET2/TL-08-1474 CapX 2020 Brookings to Hampton / Rochester to LaCrosse  
345 KV Transmission Lines  
Submitted by Cindy Helmlberger (24311 Lakeville, MN 55044 @ "New Market  
Township in Scott County ).

**I-209-001**

Your comment has been noted. While the CapX2020 projects involve four independent projects being developed in a similar time frame with some of the same of utilities participating, the Purpose and Need for the CapX2020 Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345-kV Project was developed and proven independently of the other CapX2020 projects. The Alternative Evaluation Study addresses project Purpose and Need. It is available at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>, which has been approved by the RUS. Purpose and Need will also be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

**I-209-002**

Your comment has been noted. Socioeconomic impacts to property values affected by the transmission line will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**I-209-003**

Your comment has been noted. The criteria used to route the transmission line is described in the Macro Corridor Study which is available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. These criteria and routing process will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The project is still in the development and planning stages and the utilities have not yet permitted a route for the transmission line.

**I-209-004**

Your comment has been noted. RUS anticipates that the CapX2020

My area of concern for which I am commenting on is the Rice, Scott and Dakota ( Minnesota ) counties.

Please note: The powerline is from Brookings , South Dakota and has running routes throughout Minnesota and Wisconsin . It is NOT just the Hampton/ Rochester to LaCrosse, WI line. Great River Energy and Xcel Energy's proposal was for several high voltage lines that interconnect and is multi-faceted and has future plans to these lines. Please consider the entirety of this project ( South Dakota , Minnesota and Wisconsin ) and its devastation to communities, people, landowners and the environment. If these powerlines are approved, it is only allowing future powerlines to be built and to tag onto these new powerlines. The power companies already have acknowledged and received approval to double the voltage on these 345 KV lines. So the project is not just what will happen in 2010 it will be what happens in the future. If the rights of way are granted, they and any other type of telecommunication or powerlines are given open access to whatever.

CAPX2020

•• Their mailings did NOT indicate on the outside of the envelopes that it had to do with powerlines through the person's neighborhood or backyard. People tossed the envelopes aside as they had no idea what CAPX2020 was.

•• Applicant's Appendix K " regarding public comment was only 2 pages long. There were only 393 comments out of 22,000 mailings. How could they base any decisions on routes or what people thought based on 393 comments. These comments could have been from 10 people only.

•• For landowner's whose land or homes would be impacted and require an easement " there was no certified letter mailed " just another generic envelope.

•• CAPX failed in their mailings and failed with their meetings which I am sure had very low attendance.

•• They failed in their preferred and alternate route selection. They could have chosen a route based on their own original proposals that would not impact so many people and homes.

•• In the past month or two the meetings and the involvement of citizens is due only to the citizens notifying their neighbors of what is going on.

•• CAPX2020 has proposed a build up of the Lake Marion substation in Lakeville , MN . The application references purchasing between 12 to 16 acres at the current Lake Marion substation. Allowing them to build up this station will only be an invitation for more powerlines. The area near this station is very populated with homes as it is one household per 2.5 acres. Such a massive substation should not be allowed near that many humans.

•• It is very feasible for CAPX and the utility companies to develop a new substation south of the Lake Marion one in a less densely populated area. Then they can run distributor lines from the new south substation to Lake Marion . I know someone who spoke with a person at Great River Energy who said they could build a new substation in this area and that it did NOT need to be at Lake Marion . Having two substations in the area would make the system more reliable because if there was an issue at a sole substation, then the system does not have a back up to rely on.

•• Scott County Minnesota Board voted unanimously on the topic of the powerlines and it is NOT for these lines in the county.

••

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Minnesota Administrative Rules # 7849.5910 Factors Considered:

a. Aesthetics: visual impact from project. . Scott county townships on route has a population of 8,125 and that does not include parts of New Prague. Rice county townships on route has population of 6,088. The powerlines will be seen for miles " a devastating and huge impact aesthetically and monetarily. Nobody wants powerlines in their neighborhood however, if the lines need to go somewhere the route should be where there are less people

Utilities would pay for land rights based on an independent appraisal and will work with property owners to negotiate easement payments after the permitting process.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

### I-209-005

Your comment has been noted. The criteria used to route the transmission line is described in the Macro Corridor Study which is available on the RUS website at:

<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. These criteria and routing process will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The project is still in the development and planning stages and the utilities have not yet permitted a route for the transmission line.

impacted. I heard that they may consider burying 2 miles of lines by Hiawatha because people do not want them.

b. Cultural Resources: People choose to move out to the semi-rural area for the cultural values of "small town". The values of those who spent a lot of money to purchase land and their homes will be destroyed. Example: A person spent \$200,000 on a lot in Scott County and built a \$500,000 home. Now powerlines will be in their backyard or very visible to them. Now that \$700,000 investment is reduced down to \$450,000 or less and maybe the person will get \$ 5,000 for that loss?

c. Land Use: Primarily, it is not judicious to have powerlines run through land and near homes that will lose the most financially.

d. Socioeconomic: Population information. Noted above. Repeated again: Why run powerlines through areas where there are currently more people and in the future will allow more people? Utility System: The alternate route through the areas of my concern would only cost \$ 8 million more dollars. That is only \$ 100 each for 80,000 users of electricity to make up that \$ 8 million. Let those using the electricity pay such a low amount for the extra cost. Why should those who will lose the most financially have to lose up to hundreds of thousands of dollars because the line goes through / near their home. The utility companies can very easily buy land cheaper south of here and build a new substation there and then feed a small line up to Lake Marion.

Rights of way: There are existing rights of way in Rice county, along Interstate 35, and near Cannon Falls. They could utilize these existing rights of way, create a new substation that is closer to the existing lines in land areas that are NOT more densely populated.

e. Safety and Health: Just a simple question "would you want to live near an enormous powerline?" Just a simple comment "it has to be safer to live without a line than with one."

f. Natural Environment: Sections of land in New Market township are the start of the Vermillion watershed / trout stream.

#### More Comments:

1. I would please ask that the electricity need be analyzed. Have there really been any brownouts? We will most likely not see the population growth that was experienced "will the need really be there to have such a mass increase in electricity?"

2. Are these powerlines really for the people in Minnesota and Wisconsin or is their goal to direct electricity beyond these states?

3. Will the electricity companies mitigate damage done to the environment and the monetary loss that landowners will have?

4. Please, please, please have a much more in-depth study be done.

5. Have all the right state and Federal governments commented on the issues surrounding the powerlines?

6. Have there been impact studies done on comparable powerlines that have comparable impact to like communities and environment?

7. This is a huge endeavor by the power companies and it should thoughtfully and thoroughly be investigated by the different state and Federal agencies.

8. Has the uniqueness of the joint venture between Great River Energy and Xcel been investigated thoroughly? Meaning, are they placing this under the guise of a not for profit like Great River only to turn it over to Xcel Energy?

Thank you very much for the USDA's review of this project and what the impacts are.

Sincerely,

Cindy Helmberger

**Kessler, Ellen**

---

**From:** Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC [Stephanie.Strength@wdc.usda.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 28, 2009 11:17 AM  
**To:** Lilley, Bliss; Collins, Carly  
**Subject:** FW: Scoping Comments re: CapX2020 project  
**Attachments:** letter to USDA.docx

---

From: Mary Kleese [mailto:[mkleese@myclearwave.net](mailto:mkleese@myclearwave.net)]  
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2009 7:46 AM  
To: Strength, Stephanie - Washington, DC  
Subject: Scoping Comments re: CapX2020 project

Ms. Strength,

We respectfully submit this letter on behalf of Holden Township and appreciate your consideration of it.

Sincerely,  
Doug and Mary Kleese  
4667 Co. 30 Blvd  
Kenyon, MN 55946  
507-789-6313  
[mkleese@myclearwave.net](mailto:mkleese@myclearwave.net)

To: Ms. Stephanie Strength  
Environmental Protection Specialist

Re: Cap X 2020-proposed route through Holden Township, Kenyon, MN

We live on a 3<sup>rd</sup> generation farm in Holden Township, Sec. 23 Kenyon MN. Just recently it was brought to our attention via our local newspaper that the newest revised route for one of the Cap X2020 proposed power lines is just south of our property, in direct view and vicinity of our home and livelihood. This was the first that we were made aware of this. We never received any correspondence regarding informational meetings or proposed lines that potentially would be placed so close to where we live. Though it would not directly go through our property, due to the position of our home and land, we are in constant direct view and exposure of the proposed towers. Our strong concerns regarding these proposed lines are threefold; 1) from a safety standpoint, 2) maintaining the rural integrity of the area, and 3) an aesthetics viewpoint.

I-210-001

Firstly, along with farming our own acres, we rent the acreage that the proposed lines would actually go through. Our children pick rocks from these fields twice yearly so our farm equipment is not damaged. We literally would be picking rocks under these towers. We are concerned about being able to run our machinery around and under these lines. We have read about EMF emissions and it appears that not enough studies have been done regarding 345kv transmission lines at this time. It is a real concern!

I-210-002

I-210-004

Secondly, as residents and farmers in Holden Township, we are proud of our agricultural heritage. Our township ordinances reflect this continuing goal to maintain our agricultural area and to provide area farmers the opportunity to continue farming and preserving the agricultural integrity of Holden township. Furthermore, the way the line is proposed, it would run directly down the section, causing a great disruption of the acreage and the farming practices. The number of rural acreage in Minnesota is limited. Farmland is not a renewable resource. It is difficult to understand the reasoning of disrupting and changing this rural area when other rights of way have already been developed. Transmission lines, such as the one's proposed by the Cap X2020 project, would forever disrupt and destroy our rural landscape, and arguably some of the best farm acreage in Minnesota.

I-210-003

Thirdly, we love our home and farm. We are surrounded by fields of corn and soybeans, oak groves, ninety-foot pines and a rolling landscape. We cannot adequately describe how much we appreciate the nature and landscape that surrounds us. The Zumbro River runs close to the fields we farm, wooded acres provide a natural habitat for deer, birds and many other animals. We hike through the woods, walk the fields and play outdoors. Nerstrand-Big Woods State Park is only 8 miles from us. We invite you out to our property to see for yourself what a disruption such a transmission line would be to the aesthetics, rural integrity and way of life for the farmers and residents of Holden Township.

In conclusion, we find it ironic that there is even a proposal to increase transmission lines especially so close to where we live. We, personally, have used less electricity the past few years due to our concerted effort of conservation. Our government agencies have spent a great deal of time and money

## I-210-001

Your comment has been noted. The project is still in the development and planning stages and the utilities are striving to provide the most up to date information in a timely manner. Project information is updated regularly on the project website, [www.capx2020.com](http://www.capx2020.com).

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be solicited after its publication.

## I-210-002

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to agricultural resources will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

## I-210-003

Your comment has been noted. The criteria used to route the transmission line is described in the Macro Corridor Study which is available on the RUS website at: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>. These criteria and routing process will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The project is still in the development and planning stages and the utilities have not yet permitted a route for the transmission line.

## I-210-004

Your comment has been noted. Potential impacts to human and livestock health and safety with regard to EMF will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

advocating conservation, and its working. More and more Minnesotans are seeing the need for conservation of energy and the last 2 years of consumption have decreased.

**I-210-005**

We would like to add this for consideration; why is the disruption to all of these prime farmland acres, (the acreage of which is already shrinking in this state) our agricultural heritage and way of life even being considered when agriculture hasn't created the suggested need for more power?

Respectfully submitted,

Doug and Mary Kleese

Holden Township

4667 Co. 30 Blvd

Kenyon, MN 55946

507-789-6313

### **I-210-005**

Your comment has been noted. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will describe, in detail, project purpose and need. The justification document which has been accepted by the RUS is the Alternative Evaluation study which is available at:  
<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/eis.htm>.